

My amendment has been around for over a year now. People know what it does. So to call this a cover vote is disingenuous at best.

EPA's regulations that came into effect this year say that if a company wants to retrofit an existing one or build a new powerplant or factory, they now have to find ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Because of these new rules, companies won't build that new factory, that new powerplant, or employ some of the millions of Americans who are out of work. That is why I believe these regulations need to be suspended. That is in my amendment.

Senator INHOFE has repeatedly argued that Congress needs to make these decisions. I agree with that. My bill would give Congress the time it needs to discuss the options, and my approach creates a reasonable timeout. Doing away with EPA authority doesn't give clarity; it indefinitely kicks the can down the road. My amendment, which unfortunately will come whenever it comes, no doubt won't do particularly well because all of the folks on the other side and some, unfortunately, on this side will vote for that because they think it sounds kind of neat. It probably won't do very well, but that doesn't mean it is not right.

Let's have real solutions, such as clean coal that must play a role in meeting our energy needs, and let's be sensible and bipartisan about it. West Virginia is ready to provide that coal, and so are a lot of other States.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and quickly turn to a discussion about our Nation's energy future.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCASKILL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, briefly, with regard to the debate over the limitations of CO<sub>2</sub>, global warming gases, and the Environmental Protection Agency, Congress has never made a decision on this. The way it came out, in my view, is an example of judicial activism and a dangerous end run around popular sovereignty in America.

Forty years ago, Congress passed the Clean Air Act. That act was designed to deal with particulates and mercury and NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub>—things determined to be pollutants. There was no thought at that time that carbon, or CO<sub>2</sub>, was a warming gas that would create global warming. It was before the global warming discussion really ever was generated.

Congress had no intention whatsoever to say that carbon dioxide, which is a plant food, which is not harmless to human beings and had never been classified as a pollutant, would be placed under the total control of the Environmental Protection Agency. But later an activist Supreme Court—5-to-4—seemed to say, but not with perfect clarity, that because now we know or we think some say that CO<sub>2</sub> is a global warming gas that could cause global warming, the EPA must regulate what really is a plant food and had never been considered to be a pollutant.

I think Congress needs to act. I think Congress needs to assume responsibility. We need to say: No, we are not prepared to direct that the Environmental Protection Agency control all CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the country. We never intended that. We are not prepared to do that. If we want to start down that road, we in Congress will figure out how we should start down that road and how much ought to be done. But no group of bureaucrats should be empowered to regulate every farm, every apartment building, every schoolhouse, every automobile, every vehicle, every train, much less every electric-generating plant in the country.

It is a big deal about reality and power in America. It is just one more example of how judges and bureaucrats are utilizing powers really never intended to be given to them. Really, they sort of create that to impose their agenda on the rest of the country. I believe we should back away from that. That is why I support Senator INHOFE in his view.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EPA AMENDMENTS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am here to join my colleagues who have been on the floor of the Senate today, with the leadership of Senator BOXER, to oppose amendments that would undermine the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act has been one of the greatest public health success stories we have ever had in this country. In 1970, Republicans and Democrats came together to pass this landmark legislation to address air pollution that was leading to countless deaths and lifetimes spent battling chronic illness, illnesses such as asthma and emphysema. That legislation, back in 1970, was signed into law by President Richard Nixon.

It is very clear that the threat of greenhouse gas emissions to public health is real. Two years ago the EPA

found that manmade greenhouse gas emissions threaten the health and welfare of the American people. Their decision was not made in a vacuum and, despite what some of the supporters of these harmful amendments may claim, EPA's decision was based on the best peer-reviewed science. They were guided by the best science protecting the public health, not politics. The American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, the Trust for America's Health and the American Thoracic Society—some of our Nation's leading public health experts—all opposed these misguided efforts to stop EPA from protecting our clean air.

We have heard the same story from polluters over and over. Today they tell us that reducing carbon pollution through the EPA will wreck our economy. Back in 1970, and then again in 1990, they said the Clean Air Act would wreck our economy. Time and again we have heard the same arguments, and they have not been true. It reminds me of Aesop's fable of the boy who cried wolf.

Since we passed the Clean Air Act of 1970, we have dramatically reduced emissions of dozens of pollutants. We have improved air quality, and we have improved the public health. The EPA estimates that last year alone the Clean Air Act prevented 1.7 million asthma attacks, 130,000 heart attacks, and 86,000 emergency room visits.

This is particularly important to us in New Hampshire and in New England because we are effectively the tailpipe of this country. In New Hampshire we have one of the highest rates of childhood asthma in the country because we are still phasing out some of the coal-fired plants in the Midwest that are causing these air emissions.

During the same period—since the Clean Air Act saved all of those illnesses and deaths last year—we have been able to grow our economy. Our gross domestic product has more than tripled, and the average household income has grown more than 45 percent. So we know we can protect public health, we can save our environment, and we can grow our economy.

I recognize that as Governor of New Hampshire when, back in 2001, we passed the first legislation in the country to deal with four pollutants because we understood that we needed to clean up our air and that we could do that and protect public health and keep a strong economy all at the same time. I wish that same can-do spirit and bipartisanship that led to the passage of the Clean Air Act in 1970 and then later the Clean Air Act amendments in 1990—I wish that same can-do spirit existed today to address carbon pollution. Instead of debating amendments to undercut the Clean Air Act, we should be working together to enact commonsense legislation to reduce carbon pollution and to continue to grow our economy.